



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

מְמוּן, Sir. 31:8, should be added here. P. 485b, l. 37, l. Gen. 19:9. P. 513a; with שְׁמַנְתַּה=“corpse,” may be compared its use in Nabataean in sense of “gravestone.” P. 573b, s.v. שְׁמַנְתַּה, on Hab. 3:9, cross-reference is made to נֶעֶר II Niph., where no allusion to the form is found. P. 607b, s.v. שְׁבָל II, comparison should be made with Assyr. *uplu*=“boil”; see H. Holma, *Kleine Beiträge* (1912), and S. Langdon, *AJSL*, XXX (1913), 79. P. 634b, l. 10, on שְׁמַנְתַּה in I Sam. 13:21, reference should be made to the weight recently found at Silwan in Jerusalem stamped with these letters; see Pilcher, *Pal. Explor. Fund Quart. Statement*, 1914, p. 99. P. 668b, l. 13, add Sir. 42:8; cf. Tobit 8:15. P. 883b, s.v. שְׁמַנְתַּה II; l. pi. imperfect שְׁמַנְתַּה, m. d. *acc.* besingen Ri. 5:11, so wohl auch inf. שְׁמַנְתַּה m. נִשְׁמַנְתַּה Ri. 11:40, u.s.w.; cf. this *Journal*, XIV, 448.

J. M. POWIS SMITH

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

RECENT PATRISTIC LITERATURE

In 1911 Diobouiotis of the University of Athens noticed in a manuscript at the Meteoron monastery a series of scholia on a large part of the Apocalypse, which he thought might come from the hand of Hippolytus. He sent a copy of the text to Professor Harnack with a view to publication and Harnack soon identified it as the work of Origen on the Apocalypse. It had not been known that Origen wrote a commentary or even scholia on the Apocalypse, but in his commentary on Matthew, written between 246 and 249 A.D., he expressed his intention of writing such a work. The manuscript gives the Greek text of the Apocalypse (1:1—13:18; 14:3-5) interspersed with thirty-nine scholia. Thirty-seven of these Harnack ascribes to Origen, and the last two he has traced to Irenaeus' great work *Against Heresies*, Book V. The manuscript seems to have been copied from one in which the text of the Apocalypse was written continuously and the scholia occupied the adjacent margins. The breaking off of Origen's comment at Rev. 12:2 Harnack tentatively explains as perhaps due to his arrest and imprisonment in the Decian persecution from his sufferings in which he never recovered.

Students of early Christian literature are indebted to Diobouiotis for a valuable discovery and to Harnack for one more highly interesting identification. The method of publication adopted by the editors exhibits after a brief introduction the Greek text of the thirty-nine sections of the Apocalypse, and then that of the scholia with the necessary textual notes. A discussion of the character and authorship of the

scholia follows, and an investigation of the type of text of the Apocalypse used by the scholiast concludes the work. The quickness with which this first edition of a long-lost work of Origen was prepared must explain its editorial shortcomings, which have already been skilfully dealt with by Dean Armitage Robinson in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, XIII, 295-97. In particular the interpretation Harnack puts upon a scribal comment on Scholium XXIV in which he finds a remarkable independent confirmation perhaps from Pamphilus or Eusebius, of his own identification of Origen as the author of the scholia, vanishes entirely with a slight change in accentuation (ως οὐ for Ω σον) and the abandonment of the textual changes Harnack's interpretation of the note involved. The note thus conservatively understood as Origen's comment on Rev. 3:22 ceases to have any bearing upon the authorship of the scholia and the ingenious literary argument so confidently reared by Professor Harnack (p. 55) collapses. But his brilliant identification of the scholia as the work of Origen and probably the last work from his pen stands unaffected by this unlucky excursus and adds another item to the great debt patristic studies owe to him.¹

The effort to provide the writings of the Fathers with adequate commentaries embodying new methods and the materials now available is producing valuable results in various quarters. Ganschinietz at Münster has put forth such a commentary on chaps. 28-42 of the fourth book of Hippolytus' *Refutation*.² It will be remembered that Books II and III are missing, but Ganschinietz, partly following an investigation of Alès, makes it probable that in these chapters of Book IV the bulk of Book III is really preserved. The suggestion of Hermani that Lucian in his *Alexander* and Hippolytus in these chapters were both dependent on the work of Celsus on the Magi is rejected by Ganschinietz who maintains that the lost work entitled Θρασυμήδονς τέχνη, "the Art of Thrasymedes," mentioned in the Book VI, chap. 7, is a more probable source for both. Ganschinietz gives some evidence for a date between 200 and 230 A.D. for this lost work. Careful textual notes accompany the commentary which is designed to explain the bizarre performances of the magicians Hippolytus is discussing, and to relate the practices he reports, to similar

¹ *Der Scholien-Kommentar des Origenes zur Apokalypse Johannis nebst einem Stück aus Irenaeus Lib. V Graece.* Entdeckt und herausgegeben von Constantin Diobouniotis und Adolf Harnack. (Texte und Untersuchungen, XXXVIII, 3.) Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1911. 88 pages. M. 3.

² *Hippolytos' Capitel gegen die Magier: Refut. Haer. IV 28-42.* Erklärt von Richard Ganschinietz. (Texte und Untersuchungen, XXXIX, 2.) Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1913. 77 pages. M. 2.50.

proceedings in the papyri and the magic literature. Students of Hippolytus will find this decidedly useful. It is especially agreeable to learn that we really possess in these chapters of Book IV all but the beginning of Book III, so that what is actually missing from the Refutation is now reduced to Book II and the opening part of Book III. Ganschinietz' occasional references to Dieterich's *Mithrasliturgie* suggest the suspicion that he regards that work as a genuine document of Mithraism. Of course that is not the case, for there is nothing distinctively Mithraic about it, and to refer to it by title without qualifying its extreme claims tends to perpetuate an unfortunate misconception.

The uncanonical gospel material preserved in Syriac, Coptic, and Arabic presents literary problems of much intricacy. Some of these have been investigated by Dr. Felix Haase of Breslau, and he has published his principal results.¹ The Strassburg Coptic gospel fragment published by Jacoby he would refer to a non-heretical document probably of the third century. Certain Coptic fragments published by Revillout as belonging to the Gospel of the Twelve Apostles Haase connects with a late Gospel of Gamaliel, basing the identification upon the words "I Gamaliel followed them [meaning Pilate and the rest] in the midst of the crowd." Haase puts this Gospel late, perhaps between the fifth and seventh centuries. Revillout's Coptic fragment of the Gospel of Bartholomew identifies itself with the words, "I Bartholomew the apostle of the Son of God have seen the Son of God." It is clearly gnostic and belongs to the third century. Jerome is the first writer to mention this Gospel, but it is spoken of in the Gelasian decrees and by Bede.

The materials entering into the Gospel of the Twelve Apostles published in 1900 by Rendel Harris from a Syriac manuscript in his collection are separated by Haase into apocalyptic and gospel elements. The gospel material he holds originated in Syriac and belongs to the end of the third or the beginning of the fourth century. The Coptic text reported by Schmidt in 1895 and believed to be from a Gospel of Peter, Haase thinks is a document composed by one gnostic sect in its conflict with another, not, as Harnack had maintained, a non-heretical work. Haase prefers Harnack's date, 150-80 A.D., to that of Schmidt who put it before 150. The various forms of the Gospel of Thomas, longer Greek, shorter Greek, Syriac, and Latin, seem closely related. The Latin is evidently derived mainly if not wholly from the long Greek

¹ *Literarkritische Untersuchungen zur orientalisch-apokryphen Evangelienliteratur.* By Dr. Felix Haase. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1913. 92 pages. M. 3.

form, but the resemblances of the two Greek forms and the Syriac can only be explained as due to the use of a common source now lost.

Haase further discusses the history of the Protevangelium of James, the recensions of the Acts of Pilate, and the fourteen forms of the *Transitus Mariae*, among which last he holds the Syriac to be the most original. Useful bibliographies accompany his discussions, but there is no index and the frequent English citations are rather negligently printed. But these are minor defects in a very helpful treatment of some of the most confused and intricate problems of Christian literature.

Professor Harnack has made many significant contributions to the history of the New Testament Canon in his *History of Dogma*, and smaller works, and perhaps no one has seen and stated its problems more clearly than he. He has never before presented his views on the rise of the New Testament collection in a book devoted wholly to that subject, although in his *Das Neue Testament um das Jahr 200* he dealt with what he regards as the vital stage of the whole process, in the form of an answer to Zahn's *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons*. In the short space of little more than a hundred pages he has now put forth¹ the chief elements entering into the formation of the New Testament collection and the far-reaching consequences of that process. Too many writers on the Canon quite overlook these problems and content themselves with collecting and describing the historical materials. But Harnack, perhaps because he is so expert a historian of dogma, has always struck at the heart of the problem. For, as he points out in his preface, the history of the rise of the New Testament collection is not a problem in the history of literature but in the history of worship and dogma.

In considering the historical forces that led to the creation of the New Testament, Harnack distinguishes five leading problems which demand solution: How came the church to develop a second authoritative collection side by side with the Old Testament? How came the New Testament to consist, as it anciently did, of two halves, gospel and apostle? Why does it contain four gospels instead of one? Why does it contain one Apocalypse and only one? Was the New Testament a conscious creation and how did the churches come to possess a uniform New Testament? All Professor Harnack's researches in the history of dogma, the history of early Christian literature, and the spread of

¹ *Die Entstehung des neuen Testaments und die wichtigsten Folgen der neuen Schöpfung*. By Adolf von Harnack. (Beiträge zur Einleitung in das neue Testament, VI. Heft.) Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1914. vii+152 pages. M. 4.

early Christianity serve to equip him in an extraordinary, even a unique, degree to deal with these problems.

The rise of a New Testament side by side with the Old is ultimately due to the great respect felt by Christians from the very first for the teaching of Jesus and then for the records of his teaching, in which the Old Testament prophecies were shown to be fulfilled. The consciousness of a new covenant led men to look about them for the documents that sanctioned it. The authority necessary for the formation of such a collection was found in the spiritual endowment enjoyed by apostles, prophets, and teachers. The writings of such men carried with them a certain authority. But it was the work of Marcion and the conflict with the Gnostics and the Montanists that brought into vigorous operation these latent forces tending toward an authoritative scripture.

In the fourfold Gospel Harnack rightly sees a compromise designed to reconcile adherents of the earlier Gospels and those more progressive Christians of Asia who accepted the Fourth Gospel. Thus Marcion with his Gospel and apostle, and Ephesus with its four Gospels, played leading parts in the preliminary stages of the shaping of the New Testament. But it was Rome that fixed the character and the scope of the first New Testament as catholic-apostolic and it was Alexandria that, out of the host of books it revered, increased it to the twenty-seven books that we know. Harnack develops these and kindred points with skill and vigor and with the widest learning. The last quarter of his book is devoted to the consequences of the creation of the New Testament, which he describes in a series of striking antitheses. The New Testament immediately began to be looked upon as the gift of the Holy Spirit and to influence Christian life and the development of doctrine. It subordinated to itself the historical Christian revelation and also the Old Testament which had now to be understood in the light of the New. It preserved the most valuable part of early Christian literature from destruction, but in so doing suffered many other Christian writings only less precious to perish. It has ever again led back dogmatics to history. With such consequences of the creation of the New Testament Harnack thinks writers on the subject should concern themselves since these results spring directly from the essential nature of the new collection.

Harnack thinks the formation of the New Testament was practically finished by the middle of the third century, when, in the persons of Origen and Hippolytus, Alexandria and Rome had come to accept the same list of New Testament books. A number of appendices conclude the work but many readers will regret the absence of an index. On the

whole the book is probably the most clear, incisive, and helpful sketch of the rise of the New Testament collection that has appeared.

Recent students of Justin have had much to say of his actual ignorance of the philosophies he attacked and of the illogical and miscellaneous character of his writings. The study of the *Dialogue* and the *Apologies* has convinced Hubík¹ that Justin is far more intelligent and logical than his critics have been willing to allow. He traces the course of the argument in the *Dialogue with Trypho* and concludes that it is capable of a reasonably clear and logical analysis. The *Apology*, too, upon examination proves more systematic and orderly than its critics have admitted. In this latter judgment Hubík had been anticipated by Wehofer (1897). A more novel part of Hubík's discussion is his treatment of the so-called Second *Apology*. It is a curious fact that in the Paris manuscript this stands before the longer *Apology* usually called the first, and that the longer *Apology* is in the manuscript entitled the Second *Apology*. It is likewise curious that Eusebius sometimes refers to the shorter *Apology* as the first, and more than once quotes the longer one as the *Apology addressed to Antoninus*. But on one occasion Eusebius refers to the longer one too as the first (*H.E.* ii. 13. 2). Hubík suggests that in Eusebius' time, as ever since, the shorter *Apology* stood in the manuscripts of Justin before the longer one, and was consequently quoted by Eusebius as the first (*ἡ προτέρα*) *Apology*. This is promising but not altogether convincing in view of Eusebius' quotation of the longer one as the first, in *H.E.* ii. 13. 2, and of his assignment of material from the shorter one to "the same" work to which material from the longer has just been referred (*H.E.* iv. 8. 3-5). Hubík replies that Eusebius describes the longer one as the "first" in *H.E.* ii. 13. 2, in the chronological sense, and that "the same" (*ταῦτα*) in *H.E.* iv. 8. 3-5 means the same roll or volume, not the same document. Yet skilfully as he contends for the entire independence of the two *apologies* it is difficult to escape the prevalent conviction that Eusebius really knew and quoted but one, and that his allusion to a second one is a mistake on his part. In the present state of our knowledge of the problem it is most reasonable to suppose that the shorter *Apology* is neither the first *Apology* as the manuscript virtually calls it, nor the Second *Apology* of most editors, but an appendix belonging to the long *Apology*, which last is therefore alone entitled to be called the *Apology of Justin*.

¹ *Die Apologien des Hl. Justinus des Philosophen und Märtyrers. Literarhistorische Untersuchungen von Dr. Karl Hubík.* (Theologische Studien der Leo-Gesellschaft, 19.) Vienna: Mayer, 1912. viii+383 pages. M. 7.

But Hubík goes still farther. A comparison of the Second Apology, as he considers it, with the *Octavius* of Minucius Felix satisfies him that both are answers to the same attack. It has been supposed with a good degree of probability that Minucius Felix was answering an address directed against the Christians by M. Cornelius Fronto, the tutor of Aurelius. Hubík concludes that the so-called Second Apology, like the later *Octavius*, is a reply to Fronto's work. Hubík would accordingly date the longer apology addressed to Antoninus, in 156 A.D. and the shorter addressed to Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus in 164-65. An interesting excursus on the persecution under Marcus Aurelius concludes this able and elaborate contribution to the study of Justin.

Professor Michael Rackl¹ of Eichstätt has subjected Völter's somewhat fantastic theory of the origin of the Ignatian letters to a criticism perhaps unnecessarily elaborate, and arrived at the conclusion that the seven Ignatian letters mentioned by Eusebius and the letter of Polycarp to the Philippians are genuine documents of the early years of the second century. The main task undertaken by Rackl, however, is the investigation of the Christology of Ignatius. In this inquiry he makes abundant use of a wide range of authorities, often quoting them at length. But he does not escape the tendency not infrequent with Catholic writers to read back into primitive documents doctrinal subtleties of which their authors can hardly have dreamed. That Ignatius was familiar with the Gospel of John and assumed that his readers were, is far from certain, and the especial familiarity he does evince with the Gospel of Matthew is rather blurred when he is made to seem equally well acquainted with Mark, Luke, and John. Syrian and even Antiochian Christianity in later times proved curiously slow and reluctant, as compared with the church at large, about accepting Christian writings, and such was probably its tendency from the first. One feels a certain hardness of treatment and a lack of historical perspective in Professor Rackl's work, but he has gathered into it a mass of useful material which students of Ignatius' Christology will welcome. A very extensive bibliography is prefixed to the work, and writers of all schools are freely though perhaps somewhat indiscriminately quoted in the argument and the footnotes.

EDGAR J. GOODSPEED

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

¹ *Die Christologie des heiligen Ignatius von Antiochien. Nebst einer Voruntersuchung: die Echtheit der sieben Ignatianischen Briefe verteidigt gegen Daniel Völter.* By Dr. Michael Rackl. (Freiburger Theologische Studien, XIV. Heft.). Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1914. xxxii+418 pages. \$2.20.